

QUESTIONS FROM THE ALASKAN FORUM OF THE ENVIRONMENTAL BRISTOL BAY SESSION:

1. If the Salmon runs are destroyed, what will Pebble and the EPA do? (Only question that Doug said he didn't ask.
2. Thank you EPA for finalizing the Bristol Bay Watershed Assessment and supporting to protect our fisheries.
3. Will the mining company still be allowed to go through the permitting process?
4. You say that in 2010, nine (9) tribes asked EPA to use its Authority under the Clean Water Act to stop the Pebble Project. Why is it you have not talked about the internal efforts of EPA employees to stop this project starting in 2008, including some of those who were Authors of the Watershed Assessment?
5. EPA told us very specifically that it would publish a response to people's comments on the draft Assessment. Why haven't you done so? And, is there any record to show you considered these comments.
6. Yesterday in the break out session, "elements of a modern hard-rock mine," there was discussion the Fort Knox can cause electricity black outs in Fairbanks. Why didn't the Assessment address Power? Thank you for completing the BBWA!
7. Were there efforts to obtain other mining design plans from the project proponents?
8. At the Keynote this morning, Administrator McLerran said EPA received 1.1 million public comments on the Watershed Assessment. Does EPA usually see that many comments when it seeks public input? Especially so many supportive comments?
9. For 3 years, EPA has told us that the Assessment was started in response to a May 2010 request from Tribes. Recent emails released under a Freedom of Information Act request shows that a dozen or more EPA staff, including those at a high level, discussed a 404(c) veto two years before the tribes made the request. Why did you keep that information from the public?
10. If EPA initiated the 404(c) process, what would be the deciding factor to initiate this process?
11. So now the facts are in, when will EPA use its' Authority to apply 404(c) to protect Bristol Bay?
12. Will EPA FOLLOW THROUGH WITH THE TRIBES OF Bristol Bay's request that US EPA also utilize their authority with the Clean Water Act (404(c) to further protect the waters of Bristol Bay and our salmon and fresh water fish species.
13. Instead of gold; they (Pebble) are now saying Copper mine. Copper shouldn't be released to the water due to Salmon will be affected and will not be able to find their spawning grounds. How can we; as tribes, be able to address this concern? Any suggestions?
14. Much attention is focused on the Pebble prospect, but you mention that there are other mineral deposits in Bristol Bay. Please describe the possibility that multiple mines could be developed, and, the effects that a mining district could have on the fishery!
15. There are 32 recognized tribes in Bristol Bay, as well as many other Alaska Native Village Corporations. How can EPA justify such a large mobilization of resources based on the requests of just a fraction of the Bristol Bay's interest base?
16. Could any mine with the impacts you outline actually qualify for a permit under the Clean Water Act? If not, what's the point of impacts from an unpermissible mine?
17. The Assessment says that 93% of copper mines have water treatment failures. That figure comes from an Earthworks report. Three out of four of EPA reviewers of that report said that the report is biased and you should not use the conclusions info. Why did you use it and hide the reviewers' comments?
18. a. On January 23rd, Governor Parnell considered this an "over reach."
b. What is the next regulatory process Time lines?
c. As a tribal member of Ekwok Village, I want the EPA to act now on 404(c)!